(4) 113

No. 08-353

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 25 2008
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

VAN LOCKWOOD,
3rd Party Standing,

Petitioners

vs.

JERE BEASLEY,
J. GREGG ALLEN,
WILLIAM G. O'REAR,

Respondents

Petition For a Writ of Certiorari
Judges Birch, Dubina, and Barkett
To The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeal, Atlanta, Georgia

Judge U.W. Clemon
The United States District Court,
Northern District of Alabama

MOTION FOR A REHEARING

MOTION FOR A REHEARING ON GROUNDS LIMITED TO INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF A SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT, OR TO OTHER SUBSTANTIAL GROUNDS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED IN GOOD FAITH AND NOT FOR DELAY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

VAN LOCKWOOD,
3rd PARTY STANDING,

Petitioner,

vs.

Case No. 08-353

JERE BEASLEY,
J. GREGG ALLEN,
WILLIAM G. O'REAR,

Respondents.

MOTION FOR A REHEARING ON GROUNDS LIMITED TO INTERVENING CIRCUMSTANCES OF A SUBSTANTIAL OR CONTROLLING EFFECT, OR TO OTHER SUBSTANTIAL GROUNDS NOT PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED IN GOOD FAITH AND NOT FOR DELAY

Comes now, previously on May 21, 2008, the Petitioner, Van Lockwood filed his petition stating that this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sect. 1254(1). After careful review on the printed petition, it should read that this Court does not have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. sect. 1254(1). Also, this will hold true for the Eleventh Circuit Court which does not have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sect.

1291, final decision of the District Court or 28 U.S.C. sect. 1292 interlocutory decisions. **My Motion To Stay Pending... in District, Circuit, and this Supreme Court is because the U.S. District Court where the conflict occurred retained jurisdiction, not this Court or the Eleventh Circuit. I applied the legal brakes, so let me explain...**

Since there were questions at the United States Court of Appeals as to whether at District Court, Birmingham, Alabama's Division, did Van Lockwood filed his appeal on 10/01/07 or 10/10/07 in the December 17, 2007 and February 21, 2008 Court Order. Let's see what the **U.S. District Clerk of Court, Sharon Harris**, purported on the docket report (doc. 75, Petitioner's Ex. A-2) that she, **Sharon Harris**, certified as a true copy back at District Court where jurisdiction still remains on transmitted conflicts. I will ask this Court to not only take my words..., but give me the benefit of the doubt and send the case back to the U.S. District Court based also on even my (Witness affidavit), Debbie Moore, on 8" x 11" paper Motion To Stay... May 21, 2008. She is also in the petition @ **page 93a** appendix as an extraordinary findings and certified docket excerpt reports from the **U.S. District Clerk of Court, Sharon Harris**. See Petitioner's Exhibits A, Al, A2, A3, and A4 and letter from Sharon Harris. It tells this Court that neither this Supreme Court or the Eleventh Circuit Court has subject matter jurisdiction. (Emphasis added), when Lockwood's Motions sought to stop and bring the false error on the docketing report (problems) and on other issues to a Stay at District Court and Eleventh Circuit Court. See (doc. , 82) 52 days prior to the Eleventh Circuit Court

dismissal from the October 25, 2007, Motion To Stay... Consequently, on October 19, 2007 and October 26, 2007, the District Court is causing the problem..., but "not the Honorable Judges Birch, Barkett, and Dubina". I called the District Court on these errors and filed papers and cassette tapes.

The U.S. District Court dockets 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, and 82 purports truth that is actually and only combative to the Eleventh Circuit Court (December 17, 2007) and (February 21, 2008) Court. I reiterate, I should not be denied my jurisdiction when I clearly have documents central to resolving the procedural disputes and errors I brought to all Judges attention. The District Court (Birmingham, Alabama) has jurisdiction, not the Eleventh Circuit Court (Atlanta, Georgia) on error transmissions and conflicts when a dispute arises. See: Day, 400 F 3rd at 1276 (11th Cir. 1986) holding for when dispute resolutions are not challenged. The Petitioner / Plaintiff ought to prevail on personal and subject matter jurisdiction which is held by the District Court Judge, as yet, pending on incomplete posttrial Motions filed 10/01/07 (Alabama) and (Circuit Court) it stands to reason that the Clerk of Court, Sharon Harris is there; the Judge's deputy clerk, Sonja R. Jenkins, (SRJ), Van Lockwood, and Attorney Robert Huffaker – the documents are under the advisement in the jurisdiction where these problems served as a post-reference as to what actually happened in that Court.

The Eleventh Circuit, February 21, 2008 Court order is challenged @ (doc. 76). It does mention other attachments, e.g., that would be the unmentioned Court order opened for debate at District Court, not at Circuit Court. As for the February 21, 2008 Court

order, i.e., unmentioned Court order. I also filed on 8" x 11 1/2" paper to the attention of Danny Bickell in September as a supplement to May 21, 2008 Motion To Stay.... (The Supplemental Appendix Number 1) is a copy of my motion at the Eleventh Circuit Court to alter or amend judgment (reconsideration), page 12D and 12E does in fact mentions the District Court order. See for yourself and it can be aligned with (doc. 76), Petitioner's Exhibit A-2. (Doc. 77) is a foregone subject matter that also indicates there are serious District Courts civil procedure issues, transcript disputes, notice of appeal fees, and notice of appeal with Court order issues.

Sharon Harris reports says in effect that Judges Birch, Barkett, and Dubina Court order is reporting an error on dates thought to be correct, but as you can see, it is one hundred percent (100 %) out of law in truth. The District Court is clearly showing at one hundred percent (100 %) @ (doc. 75) law/truth that I, **Van C. Lockwood**, filed in timely manner on **October 1, 2007**. The Eleventh Circuit Court order December 17, 2007 is reporting I filed October 10, 2007. Compare (doc. 76) to (doc. 82), you will see the problem clearly the first time why the Motion To Stay, May 21, 2008 is substantial and could have a controlling effect on this deemed civil technical error made by some others rather than Dr.Van Lockwood.

The intervening circumstances of the May 21, 2008, **"MOTION TO STAY PENDING THE APPLICATION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI"** was also filed in this United States Supreme Court; it was filed to the attn: of Mr. Danny Bickell. See proof of delivery in U.S. Mail Certified Mail Return Receipt requested. See (Proof on Page 20 in the Petitioner's

(Tan) Appendix Exhibit 111a) inside of my Tan Supplemental Briefs which were deemed as not until October 30, 2008. The Supplement Briefs were not perhaps presented on October 31, 2008 before Justices voted or had time to read these tan briefs. The docket does not show the Stay .... Motion filed in good faith and not delayed May 21, 2008. However, on this docket report, the relied-on Motions were not presented to a Justice pursuant to USSC Rule 23.2 and 23.3 to which I met all the lower requirements where no relief was given by any Court.

The second intervening circumstance is that the Tan Supplemental Briefs Motion stated that it was distributed on October 28, 2008, just before the conference may be misrepresented. The documents had not cleared security on the 28th of October, at best, it was not on the docket until October 30, 2008. I believe it did not make the conference. It was placed in the U.S. Postal Mail System but may not have made the conference October 31, 2008 (?) for its limited purpose, it's substantial. (On page 17, Exhibit Appendix 109a, *Julius LaVonne Chambers* absconded the jurisdiction with potential millions of dollars is (criminal) posing as an attorney with the intent to defraud the Court and 19,000 Plaintiffs.This Court is for the people, of the people, and by the people. Chambers does not have utility as a claims administrator in Ex. 109a on dicovery, it is a posttrial issue.

This is important, please listen... The Motion filed to **STAY** in the District Court was due to District Court clerk error(s) and not any errors I made, but motions were filed in both the District Court and the Eleventh Circuit Court were denied pursuant to Rules 23.2 and 23.3. But when the Motion To Stay ....

was filed on May 21, 2008, it met the Rules in 23.2 and 23.3 to which a Justice was required to give consideration, **(emphasis added)** since I never heard from Danny Bickell that the Motion would not be placed on the docket. It's clear to me it was accepted in good faith without delay and a Justice would have seen the following circumstances affront the Eleventh Circuit Court that did not all appear in the petition, e.g., witness affidavit(s), docket reports, cancelled checks, and receipts. Such documentations are of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented can be reference on 8" x 11 1/2" paper which contains the (stated Supreme Jurisdiction) and (relief I sought) in the Supreme Court. May 21, 2008 is a substantial alternative to the Petition which are generally denied.

[My legal strategy] was to exhaust every legal remedy that gave me access to Justice, (1) the Petition and (2) the Motion to Stay is substantial to me, because it is the backup Motion on order in the event that certiorari was denied because it is generally not granted. I took the steps in the Lower Courts to avoid this Supreme Court and filed timely, so that I, Van Lockwood, could retain jurisdiction on subjects that matter i.e., subject matters jurisdiction is bound to the District Court on a Stay to the correction of the records on issues that were potentially harmful or detrimental to me before going to the Eleventh Circuit or preparing my Eleventh Circuit case. The clerk's errors were too "harsh" for me to prevail over, unless I brought a timely objection to preserve the records (doc. 80). I have done this, none of us are perfect @ (doc. 79).

The Respondents, Attorney Robert A. Huffaker did not know how to order or where to order his transcripts, he sent the order form to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Atlanta, Georgia @ doc 80. These Respondents/Defendants on **10/01/2007** as stated @ (doc. 80) went before Judge U.W. Clemon doc. re 79 is another direct testimony that the Defendants validates Sharon Harris, the U.S. District Clerk of Court and my witness, Debbie Moore's Affidavit as a witness on the docket with personal and firsthand knowledge who is notarized in an oath under penalty of perjury is an eyewitness to these proceedings (timely filed) were held on 10/01/07, Id., (doc 80 also proves that Judges, Circuit Appeal Judges Birch, Barkett, Dubina order is overstated as a misfit of Justice one hundred percent (100%) incorrect on the record.

The U.S. District Clerk of Court, Sharon Harris, has certified the docket report as a true copy in the Petitioner's Ex. A. Therefore, I request that this Supreme Court kick this case back down to District Court, Birmingham, Alabama Division remanded on civil technical procedural errors that are not on substantial matters, "but technical reporting errors" to which a potentially denied claim is also in error of dismissal and can be altered or amend judgment on the evidence presented on a course of correction I filed a Motion to alter or amend judgment 10/01/07.

The U.S District Court Judge, Birmingham, Alabama Division has not had the opportunity to grant or deny the Motions. Here, the Petitioner movant to the Court's Judge ought to have this right. I hope you agree... The 2nd Motion contains therein other "discovery evidences" and lawful objections

brought to the Judge's attention; there are substantial or controlling intervening circumstances not previously presented that may have been an oversight, and are good cause for me to have challenged the 8/31/07 ruling. Seeking resolution at District Court was my Good Faith effort and early detection of reciprocal errors at both District and Circuit Court... That is my job, to represent facts and to object to errors on unilateral and unrepresented issues that were timely filed to the Notice of the U.S. District Court. Yet there is a resolution I am confident I can resolve at the Lower Court.

I can knock down every lie or error set against my case, because I hold documents evid. tape recordings legally received that are central to my case. The Respondents do not deserve to prevail on a technical error, and my expectation should not be cut off on Conclusory. A Premature Conjecture should be Condemned. The case should be placed back on the Posttrial Motions Procedural tracts, on a Stay that exhausts remedies on substantial resolutions over civil technical procedural conclusory. [Here] Errors occurred under the jurisdiction of U.S. District Court. That is why it should be returned to the District Court. In respect to free speech, that is all I have ever asked.

This is not the first time Lockwood v. Beasley had docketing problems. It was actually the [Defendants-Respondents] that had similar problems with docketing. They told the Honorable Bowdre Court that they filed a motion and it was missing from the docket; it was due [out of time] for nearly 10 days - 2 weeks, "**Nothing on the Docket.**" An appeal was filed in 2005 for default. The Eleventh Circuit

Court Judge said default was too harsh for Defs... and remanded the case back to the Court that retained jurisdiction. That is my point. *I should not be in the U.S Supreme Court.* Lockwood argued a landmark case (Cosmic Construction v. United States) where Defendants used a private carrier and were filing out of time. If default is too harsh for Respondents, then a Premature Rush to Judgement is too harsh on the Petitioner/Injured Person (docs. 75 and 76). It would be the conclusory of an issue where third party and and other persons handling instruments, like Danny Bickell, Van Lockwood, Sonja Jenkins, and Atty. Robert Huffaker @ doc. 70, not knowing how or where to file his transcript should be allowed some leniency.

The Eleventh Circuit Court would only reach conclusory on the matters it would be premature and a rush to judgement to overlook pending posttrial Motions in District or Circuit Court(s) to determine who the winner actually is. We know this from experience... that posttrial Motions are essential to a case, especially when the injury party have posttrial Motions Pending that are central to his claim. See Day, 400 F 3rd at 1276 (11th Circuit 1986) especially when there are technical procedural disputes that might prevent the injured party in a PCB personal injury claim that he might not ever recover if the case Motion was denied, or not sent back to District Court for remedy on posttrial Motions, etc... See Petitioner's Exhibit B, 11th Circuit Docket Report.

As you can see, in Ex. B, on October 25, 2007, I made the Eleventh Circuit Court Judges aware that there were jurisdictional (Alabama) problems in a STAY Motion,,,, before the December 17, 2007 and February 21, 2008 Circuit Court order(s). They were

made aware that there was a harsh problem at District Court, not knowing what the Circuit Court would do. They were informed "early" that we had dates dispute problems, docketing problems, lost or misplaced documents, (like the Defs in August, 2004 had missing docket problems). Accordingly, disputes of lost, misplaced docketing problems are essential to posttrial Motions, e.g., Motion to alter or amend Judgment filed in time October 1 2007 See (doc. 74. Petitioner's Exhibit A-2, Docket Report.

(Emphasis Added), all lower Courts were informed we had date disputes, fees, Notice of Appeal with additional attachments, See: (doc. 77), transcript disputes. It would be premature to go to the Eleventh Circuit without a resolve on jurisdictional issues (Alabama). I hope you all agree... Since this is the Court with the underlying problems where I forth-rightly advanced to the Courts where the jurisdiction lie as well.

Ms. Sharon Harris, U.S. District Clerk of Court has a supporting witness. Her name is Sonja R. Jenkins, initials (S.R.J.) On docket report. Ms. Jenkins is the deputy clerk to Judge U.W. Clemon vicariously the clerk of Court has cleared this matter up that has been combating me. Even in the February 21, 2008 Court order (Doe. 76, Petitioner's Ex. A-2). This Court, The United States Supreme Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction as a matter of intervening discovery ...., because there are conflicts and procedurals, and transmissions problems in the fore-stated District Court jurisdiction where it would be premature to cutoff jurisdiction on conclusory. Let the truth be told as to what Van C. Lockwood did, he made a smart move to give the Courts' Notices

(Motions) and retain a receipt in original inks, cancelled checks, etc... I gave Notices by request / dispute because it would be too dangerous to do nothing .... based on my legal training to never sit back and do nothing. I could hear Alabama's Supreme Court Justice, Ralph Cook raising his voice loudly as he would sometimes do to me and my classmates; he taught us tort law classes, e.g., when the dangerous place is on your land and you know of it, what do you do to an undiscovered trespasser! (?) ....

"The only thing that is necessary for evil to triumph is for good men and women to do nothing..." (Author unknown)

In my showing up at this Great Court by the Grace of God, let all 9 Justices, when they vote again, find that I did something about these procedural evils. I have not won the war it's too early to tell, I have not lost the war but I deserve to win this battle! I ask that you send this case back to the Jurisdiction where the problems lie and can be investigated and corrected. As for intervening circumstances, on my Motion To Stay to this Court and the Lower Court, Rules 23.2, 23.3 states that a Justice may Grant this requested relief I seek (Relief is Sought) from Alabama District Court. The injured party plaintiff(s) have not received compensation for injury and no remedy is in place. My Motion filed Oct. 1, 2007, Motion To Alter or Amend Judgement at Judge U.W. Clemon's District Court has not been **Granted or Denied**. It is a posttrial Motion, as the motions are still pending in U.W. Clemon's Jurisdiction. Was I smart enough to file it on time? Yes - in 400 Day f. 3rd at 1276 (11th Circuit 1986).

CLOSING SUMMARY OF REVIEW

The movant Petitioner Van C. Lockwood who moves this Honorable Court of Justice pursuant to Rule 44, Rule 44.1, Rule 44.2, Rule 23.2, Rule 23.3 Stay.

The Petitioner has met the requirement in Rule 38(b). The Supreme Court is hearing a case that is premature and does not have subject matter jurisdiction. The relief the Petitioner seeks is in the District Court of Birmingham Alabama N.D. in this instance the extraordinary statement below I do hereby certify as truthful on grounds of intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented.

I do hereby present together with certification of counsel (or of a party unrepresented by counsel) that it is restricted to grounds specified in this paragraph and that it is presented in good faith and not for delay. A set of 3 copies will be served on the Respondent by U.S. Express Mail Next Day Service so that on the evening or am, should they want to respond they will have this motion early and to which this U.S. Supreme Court shall have 40 copies in Tan Color White Tape Saddle Stitched and placed in the regular U.S. Mail System, to allow the Respondent opportunity to respond to the unilateral course Motion of the case, another good cause that the case should be sent back to the Lower Courts, because it is incomplete and would set forth an alteration of material facts, proved adverse to the Petitioner and to which the District Court Judge retains complete Jurisdiction over the issues. The 11th Circuit Court

can not reach Jurisdiction because there are docketing report problems with transmission on 10/10/07 documents. Inside the District Court these were lost or missing documents. The 11th Circuit Court can not reach subject matter jurisdiction on incomplete voice of the Court's Judge on posttrial Motions and other underlying procedural problems in dispute. Similar problems in one of several instances occurred in August 2004 with the Respondents. I do not feel victimized by purporting these truths. Compensation has not been recovered in accordance with law. Post trial Motions conjecture is not allowed on other extrinsic evidence not allowed. May the Court give Plaintiff and Defendants the benefit of the doubt, based on discovery of intervening circumstances. See Tan Supplemental Brief 10/30/08 (page 20 Petitioner Appendix 111a). Nothing was ever said about my Motion to Stay in District Court; to this Court, the evidence is substantial.

QUESTION ON A PROPOSITION OF LAW TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.... *Should the person Julius LaVonne Chambers that alleged himself to be an attorney and lawful claims administrator in the Tolbert Case at the Petitioner's [Appendix Exhibit 109a, page 17] Tan briefs have been licensed to practice law in Alabama?* Exhibit 109a from the Alabama Bar purports that he was never licensed. Mr, Chambers was placed in control over 300 million dollars at AmSouth Bank by US District Court Judge U.W. Clemon. Mr. Chambers, perhaps feloniously, and under false pretense, willfully defrauded and deceived 19,000 plaintiffs. The Docket sheet shows he took an undisclosed amount of money from us, and later removed himself from the legal proceedings. *Does this problem fall within the Jurisdiction of the U.S. District Courts?*

****

Van Lockwood Petitioner Exhibits
See Following Exhibits
A, A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4

District Court Certified
Docket Report Excerpts
Clerk of Court N.D. Alabama
Sharon Harris
Clerk of Court Certified as
True Copy

****

Petitioner Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Hugo Black Federal Courthouse
1729 5th Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203
Office: (205) 278-1717
Cellular: (205) 475-3608
Fax: (205) 278-1772
Sharon_Harris@alnd.uscourts.gov
Sharon N. Harris, Clerk

Van Lockwood
P.O. Box #40004
Jacksonville, Florida 32203-0004

In Re: 1:04cv1405-UWC - Letter Request for Verification of documents

Dear Dr. Lockwood,

I received your letter request for verification of documents today in an envelope marked "under seal/confidential." Please note that you must have the court's permission to tender documents under seal and there is no order sealing submissions in the above-styled case.

In response to your request I have enclosed a certified copy of the docket sheet for your reference in determining the dates of filing of all submissions to the court. The fee for the nine page docket sheet and certification is $13.50. Please send us a check to cover the cost of your request.

Sincerely

Sharon Harris

/snh
encl.

Petitioner Exhibit A-1

CM/ECF - U.S. District Court Northern District of Alabama - Docket Report

STAYED

U.S District Court
Northern District of Alabama (Eastern)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #:
1:04-cv-01405-UWC
Internal Use Only

Lockwood v. Beasley, et al	Date Filed: 07/01/2004
Assigned to: Judge U.W. Clemon	Date Terminated: 08/31/2007
Demand: $0	Jury Demanded: None
Case in other court: US. Court of Appeals-Eleventh Circuit, 06-12698-E	Nature of Suit: 360 P.I.: Other
Cause: 28:1331 Fed. Question: Personal Injury	Jurisdiction: Federal Question
Plaintiff	
Van Lockwood	
represented by	**Van Lockwood** PO Box 40004 Jacksonville, FL 32203-0004 904-519-2959 PRO SE

Petitioner Exhibit A-1 (CONT.)

V. **Defendant** **Jere L. Beasley** represented by	**R Austin Huffaker, Jr** RUSHTON STAKELY JOHNSTON & GARRETT PA 184 Commerce Street PO Box 270 Montgomery, AL 36101-0270 334-206-3100 Fax: 334-481-0815 Email: rah2@rsjg.com *ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED*

https://ecf.alnd.circ11.den/cgi-bin/DktRpt.pl?860329978705853-L_353_0-1

Petitioner Exhibit A-2

CM/ECF - U.S. District Court Northern District of Alabama - Docket Report

05/08/2007	67	AFFIDAVIT of Verification in care of Debbie Moore's Affidavit 3/23/06 from Albert G. Lyles, Jr., filed by Plaintiff Van Lockwood. (SRJ,) (Entered: 05/09/2007
05/08/2007	68	MOTION to Strike defendant's Motion to consolidate cases 9 with attachments, filed by Van Lockwood. (SRJ,) (Entered: 05/09/2007)
06/27/2007	69	Remark: copy of court's order doc 69 mailed to plaintiff, via US Regular Mail. (KLL,) (Entered: 06/27/2007)
07/24/2007	70	Evidentiary Material filed by Van Lockwood. (KSS,) (Entered: 07/27/2007
08/07/2007	71	MOTION to Strike by Jere L. Beasley, J. Gregg Allen, William G O'Rear, Jr. (Huffaker, R) (Entered: 08/07/2007)

Petitioner Exhibit A-2 (CONT.)

10/04/2007	74	NOTICE filed by pro sé plaintiff Van Lockwood entitled SUMMARY of Closing Argument on Reconsideration, (SRJ,). Entered: 10/09/2007)
10/10/2007	75	NOTICE OF APPEAL filed by plaintiff Van Lockwood. Filing fee $455 paid. Receipt Number 200 240209. [DEEM FILED 10/01/2007] (SRJ,). (Entered: 10/10/2007)
10/11/2007 *	76	Transmission of Notice Appeal and Certified Docket Sheet to US Court of Appeals re 75 Notice of Appeal (SRJ,) Additional Attachments(s)

		added on 10/11/2007 (SRJ,). (Entered: 10/23/2007)
10/19/2007	77	NOTICE of Supplement to the record with cassette tape attached, filed by plaintiff Van Lockwood. (SRJ,) (Entered: 10/23/2007)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
10/26/2007 15:43:12			
PACER login:	pa0000	Client Code:	Public Access:
Billable Pages:	5	Cost:	0.40

Petitioner Exhibit A-4

CM/ECF - U.S. District Court Northern District of Alabama - Docket Report

		Closing Argument on Reconsideration, (SRJ,). (Entered: 10/09/2007)
10/05/2007	75	NOTICE OF TRANSCRIPT INFORMATION FORM stating "no transcript is required for appeal purposes", filed by Van Lockwood. (SRJ,). (Entered: 11/13/2007)
10/10/2007	76	NOTICE OF APPEAL filed by plaintiff Van Lockwood. Filing fee $ 455 paid. Receipt Number 200 240209. [DEEM FILED 10/01/2007] (SRJ,) . (Entered: 10/10/2007)
10/11/2007	77	Transmission of Notice of Appeal and Certified Docket Sheet to US Court of Appeals re 75 Notice of Appeal (SRJ,) . (Entered: 10/11/2007)
11/08/2007	79	Appeal Remark re 76 Notice of Appeal: US Court of Appeals-11th Circuit sent the attached letter and Transcript Order Information Form completed by defendants' counsel stating that their court has not received

Petitioner Exhibit A-4 (CONT.)

		acknowledgement of certification of completion of financial arrangement from USDC-ALND, etc., ONLY the plaintiff returned the transcript order form see doc. #75, requesting no transcript. attorney Huffeker for defendants had not requested a transcript from district court but sent transcript order request to US Court of Appeals. Attached Transcript Request will be filed and forwarded to Court Reporter. (SRJ,) .. (Entered: 11/13/2007)
11/08/2007	80	TRANSCRIPT REQUEST by defendant for proceedings held on 10/1/2007 before Judge U.W. Clemon, re 79 Appeal Remark; DEEM FILED 10/25/2007 @ US Court of Appeals- 11th Circuit. (SRJ,) (Entered: 11/13/2007)
12/18/2007	82	MANDATE of USCA as to 76 Notice of Appeal filed by Van Lockwood; This appeal is hereby DISMISSED for Lack of Jurisdiction and Appellant's Motion to Stay appellate proceedings is DENIED as MOOT; Issued As Mandate 12/17/2007 before USCA Appeal Circuit

		Judges BIRCH, DUBINA, and BARKETT, (SRJ,) (Entered: 01/09/2008)

A TRUE COPY
SHARON N. HARRIS, CLERK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
BY: _____
DEPUTY CLERK

****

PETITIONER EXHIBIT B
11th Circuit Court of Appeal
Docket Report Excerpts

****

Petitioner Exhibit B

PUBLIC

United States Court of Appeals
11th Circuit-Atlanta
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, GA 30303-2289
(404) 335-6100
07-14802-FF

Thomas K. Khan, Clerk

Van Lockwood v. Jere L. Beasley

Entry Date 10/16/07

Date 2 10/16/07

Docket Entry
DKT2 (Docketing Notice) issued. To: Lockwood, Van; c: David B. Byrne, III; c: Robert Austin Huffaker, Jr.; c: Robert C. Brock, "Mike"; c: Thomas H. Keene

Party Lockwood, Van

Pend

Entry Date 10/25/07

Date 2 10/23/07

Docket Entry
Transcript Order Form: 8/24/07 (ProSe)

Party Lockwood, Van

Petitioner Exhibit B (CONT.)

Pend

Entry Date 10/25/07

Date 2 / /

Docket Entry
Certificate of Interested Persons: **(ProSe)**

Party Lockwood, Van

Pend

Entry Date 10/25/07

Date 2 / /

Docket Entry
Motion to Stay Further Appellate Proceedings: see court order of 12/17/07 (ProSe)

Party Lockwood, Van

Pend

Printed: February 27, 2008